DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 215 670 IR 010 106

AUTHOR Dondis, Donis
TITLE The Development of Critical Television Viewing Skills in Post-Secondary Students. Final Report (Phase I, September 30, 1978-December 31, 1979. Phase II, March 1, 1980-July 31, 1981).
INSTITUTION Boston Coll., Chestnut Hill, MA. School of Public Communication.
SPONS AGENCY Department of Education, Washington, DC.
PUB DATE Aug 81
CONTRACT 300-78-0496
NOTE 47p.; For related documents, see IR 010 102-107.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Adult Education; Audiovisual Aids; Broadcast Television; *Curriculum Development; *Evaluative Thinking; Formative Evaluation; *Instructional Development; Learning Modules; Models; Postsecondary Education; Skill Development; *Teacher Workshops; Television Curriculum; *Television Viewing
IDENTIFIERS *Critical Television Viewing Skills Project

ABSTRACT

This final report summarizes the activities of Phase 1 and Phase 2 of a project designed to develop curriculum materials to teach critical television viewing skills at the postsecondary level, including individuals in various community and professional groups, as well as students in formal educational programs. Defining such skills as those which enable television viewers to become more discriminating in their viewing habits, the project focused on developing materials that enable the viewer to: (1) distinguish between various program formats, (2) tell fact from fiction, (3) understand that television has its roots in the print medium, and (4) interpret various visual and aural stimuli from television. The report includes a summary of the development, field testing, distribution, teacher training, and publicity phases of the project. (MER)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED215670

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

THE DEVELOPMENT OF CRITICAL TELEVISION VIEWING SKILLS IN POST-SECONDARY STUDENTS. FINAL REPORT

Boston College: School of Public Communication

IR010104

INTRODUCTION

The following is the final report from Boston University's School of Public Communication for contract #300-78-0496 "The Development of Critical Television Viewing Skills in Post-Secondary Students." This contract was held with the U. S. Department of Education.

Included in the final report are activities conducted during Phase I of the project (September 30, 1978 - December 31, 1979) as well as those of Phase II (March 1, 1980 - July 31, 1981). The Project Director for the School of Public Communication is Donis Dondis. The U. S. Department of Education Project Officer is Dr. Frank Withrow.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Phase I Activities:	Page
Curriculum Development	4
Field Testing	13
Distribution	20
Teacher Training Materials	22
Publicity	25
Extension Period	26
Phase II Activities:	29
Workshops	31
Publishing	41
Publicity	43
Summary	44

PHASE I ACTIVITIES

September 30, 1978 - December 31, 1979

CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT

Under contract #300-78-0496 with the U. S. Office of Education, DHEW, Boston University's School of Public Communication developed a curriculum and curriculum materials designed to teach Critical Television Viewing Skills to those at the post-secondary level. By "post-secondary," it was interpreted to mean those individuals at an educational level beyond that of high school or secondary school. This interpretation includes students at universities, colleges, junior and community colleges, continuing education programs, adult education programs, and individuals who are members of community, professional, religious, and civic groups that are interested in the study of television. Although the original intention of the Office of Education limited the scope of the audience to students at traditional educational institutions, Boston University's School of Public Communication felt that a broader, more flexible approach was needed. It is hoped that this broad approach will result in a more widely distributed and used curriculum package.

By "Critical Television Viewing Skills" it is meant those skills which enable television viewers to become discerning viewers. Included in this definition is the ability to distinguish between various television program formats, to tell fact from fiction, to understand that television has its foundation in print, and to interpret various visual and aural stimuli from television. Those individuals who develop critical television viewing skills, hopefully through the use of this curriculum, will become aware and active rather than passive television viewers. In addition, critical television viewers may be more willing to participate in public decision-making concerning the role of television and its future in American society.

THE CURRICULUM DESIGN

The curriculum designed by Boston University's School of Public Communication is divided into four separate modules: Television Literacy, Persuasive Programming, Entertainment Programming, and Informational Programming. Each of these modules is comprised of six Concept sections that concentrate on specific topics: For example, Module I has as its six concepts: 1) The Structure of TV, 2) The Techniques of TV, 3) The Creative Process of TV, 4) The Business of TV, 5) The Politics of TV, and 6) The Effects of TV.

Each Module of the post-secondary curriculum has its own supportive print materials. There are three print components per module: student text, student workbook, and instructor's guide. The student text is made up of explanatory narrative, companion fact sheets, exercises, selected readings, and a specific section entitled "TViewpoints" which compares opposing quotes on a pertinent television issue.

The student workbook is a "consummable" complimentary text to the basic student text. In it are exercise sheets especially designed to coincide with specific exercises outlined in the student text. Although the workbook is a valuable curriculum component, it is not crucial to a successful course in critical television viewing skills. This flexibility in curriculum design should make the curriculum package more usable and marketable.

As an aide to instructors offering the critical television viewing skills curriculum, Boston University has developed a four-part instructor's guide. This guide provides to instructors an introduction to each module and is further divided into each concept section found in the Module. In each concept section are an introduction to the concept, an explanation

of each student exercise, learning objectives, discussion and quiz questions, a discussion on the included TViewpoints, and a suggested student or group project. In addition, the Instructor's Guide includes a list of consumer and media action groups, all the workbook exercise sheets for that module, and additional TV station licensing information not found in the student text.

The curriculum, as originally conceived, was meant to be used as one unit covered over one or two semesters, depending upon the character of the class or group. However, upon further consideration, the School of Public Communication revised its plan in order to provide for a more expanded use of the curriculum. As it now exists, the post-secondary curriculum can be used as a single unit or can be broken into its four modules for use in related disciplines. Thus, an institution or group can offer a course in Critical Television Viewing Skills extending over several weeks, or it can use different modules as texts in related courses. For example, Module I can be used by students of broadcasting, communications, English, popular culture, sociology, or economics. Similarly, Module II can be used by students of advertising, business, marketing, communications, sociology or public relations. Obviously, this flexibility of the curriculum will encourage more widespread use of the materials and may eventually spark an increased interest in the study of television.

CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT - QUARTERLY PROGRESS

This section will describe work progress made in Task I - Curriculum Development - during each quarter.

First Quarter:

During the first quarter, the School of Public Communication began the task of designing and developing the proposed post-secondary curriculum to teach critical television viewing skills. Three groups were involved in this initial stage: Project Administration (especially Project Director Donis Dondis), Curriculum Development Staff, and Consultants. The curriculum development staff was primarily made up of faculty members from the School of Public Communication who had expertise in both curriculum development and the study and use of media. The consultant group was made up of educational writers, psychologists, independent television producers, TV critics, and curriculum specialists. All members of these developmental groups have extensive backgrounds in either education and/or media, especially television. It was our intention to combine these skills to produce a curriculum package specifically designed for the post-secondary, or adult, audience.

Of primary concern during the first quarter was the establishment of a firm theoretical base upon which to design the curriculum. To accomplish this task, the curriculum development staff conducted a literature review and synthesis. This literature search concentrated on some very specific areas of interest to a post-secondary audience. In particular, the staff reviewed such topics as: 1) visual and media literacy, 2) the psychological, sociological, and educational impact of television, and 3) the television viewing habits of adults. From this search came the preliminary curriculum model, a four-module structure focusing on four general topics of concern to the development of critical television viewing skills. At this time, the four areas of concentration were firmly set at Media or Television Literacy, Persuasive Programming, Entertainment Programming, and Informational Programming.

The School of Public Communication also decided to develop Module II, Persuasive Programming, before Modules I, III, and IV. This decision was based upon Module II's suitability for field testing. It was in forming Module II that our writers and curriculum experts resolved problems of format, final structure, and overall approach. In addition, questions concerning the amount of material to be presented in the original course time allotted were discussed, causing Module II to be revised and edited.

While finalizing the content and structure of Module II, the curriculum development staff conducted informal surveys among classes at the School of Public Communication to determine the appropriate approach and sophistication level of the materials. In this way, the curriculum development staff was most fortunate to have the target population so accessible during material development.

The final task of the curriculum development during the first quarter was the initial preparation for the development of audio/visual materials. To this end, the staff began solidifying ideas for the slide/tape program and the videotape and examined the school's videotape library of commercials, news broadcasts and entertainment programs for examples that were appropriate and accessible.

Second Quarter:

During the second quarter, the curriculum development staff completed Module II and began final edits on Modules I and III. At this time, the curriculum development staff had planned on a slightly different set of print materials than the final design. It was then assumed that there would be a student workbook which would include narrative, exercises, and

exercise sheets, a reading book which would include pertinent articles; and a teacher's guide. As was mentioned in the introduction to this section, this initial design was later revised.

However, there were revisions to the materials also made in the second quarter. In recognizing the need to develop more responsible television viewers, the curriculum added explanatory material describing the purpose of the curriculum to the beginning of the workbook and television consumer information to the end of the workbook.

The graphic design and final format of the workbook was also decided upon during the second quarter, although both were later changed to suit some major revisions incorporated later in the project. At this time Module II had to be prepared and printed for use in the field test. The remaining modules depended upon the results of the evaluation for their final format and development.

Work was begun on the teacher's guide during the second quarter and a first edition was included in the evaluation package. This edition included learning objectives for each concept section, discussion questions, and project suggestions for each concept, questions and discussions for Action/Reaction sections (later called TViewpoints), a bibliography, and suggested readings that appeared in the student material.

Third Quarter:

The third quarter marked the final stages of manuscript preparation for the student and teacher texts. However, the curriculum development staff conducted a final edit and review to insure as timely and current a level of information on the television industry as possible. The

concern for timely information was based upon the fact that the curriculum would have a lag time of approximately one year between the time of production and that of actual classroom use.

At this time, the curriculum development staff also chose final illustrations for the manuscript. Great care was taken in this process to insure a balanced sexual, racial, and ethnic presentation. However, it was determined late in the fourth quarter that the included illustrations did not reach the sophistication level of the post-secondary audience. Even at this time, though, efforts were begun to find illustrations that were more complex and more informational.

During the third quarter the curriculum development staff also began a photo search for appropriate photographs to be included in the student texts. Fortunately, the crew of CBS' 60 Minutes was at Boston University and was willing to allow our photographers to film some on-location shooting. In addition to the 60 Minutes photos, the curriculum staff also chose from several photographs obtained from WGBH-TV and WCVB-TV for use in the student texts.

The curriculum development staff then reviewed several scripts from currently aired television programs. The inclusion of actual scripts was an important consideration in the student text to give students a realistic experience with the print origins of television. While we cannot print an entire script because of copyright restrictions, we will print considerable portions as we are allowed.

Although the audio/visuals proposed by the School of Public Communication were initially planned during the second quarter, actual development of treatments and scripts began in the third quarter. It

It was anticipated that actual production of the slide/tape, filmstrip, and videotape would take place in the fourth quarter.

To insure timely completion of the texts, the curriculum development staff began in the second quarter to seek reprint permissions to reprint copyrighted material. During the third quarter many of those permissions were obtained. However, permission was sought for educational use. Copyright authorization from U. S. O. E. and the involvement of a publisher was necessary to obtain full rights to this material.

Fourth Quarter:

The curriculum materials were submitted to the Office of Education with the Phase II proposal and were reviewed during the fourth quarter. Suggestions were made by the review committee for the revision and improvement of the design and content of the materials. The School of Public Communication immediately began to incorporate those revisions into the materials. Of particular concern was the lack of design sophistication which the reviewers felt did not adequately reflect the needs of the post-secondary student. The curriculum development committee began during the fourth quarter to re-design and re-work the student materials. To accomplish this task, it was necessary to request a three-month, no-cost extension of our contract with the Office of Education, moving the material deliverable date to December 31, 1979.

Aside from planning the re-design of the materials, the curriculum development staff began the actual production of the audio/visual materials. The slide/tape and film-strip programs were developed first and are titled "America...Sold on TV." The videotape was begun in the

fourth quarter and finished early in the extension period. It is called "Living With Television" and is approximately 30 minutes long. All the audio/visual materials can be used as part of the teacher training materials or as part of the actual curriculum.

Extension Period:

During this period the curriculum development staff completed all requirements set by the Office of Education for the development of curriculum materials. In addition, the School of Public Communication has completed all audio/visual materials proposed in the original Phase I proposal. Boston University's School of Public Communication feels strongly that the post-secondary curriculum is well suited to the variety of post-secondary students and individuals interested in the study of and development of critical television viewing skills.

TASK 2 - FIELD TESTING

The development of a plan for evaluation took place concurrently with the curriculum development. Director of Research for Task 2 was Dr. F. Earle Barcus, a faculty member of the School of Public Communication and a researcher on the effects of television advertising on children. Dr. Barcus was assisted in this project by a graduate student with a specialty in communications research.

First Quarter:

Under the terms of contract #300-78-0496 with the U. S. Office of Education, Boston University's School of Public Communication was required to conduct a formal field testing of the post-secondary curriculum. The contract called for formal testing in five locations representing a geographical distribution. Data was to be gathered on the effectiveness of the curriculum in teaching critical television viewing skills. In preparation for this field testing, the Office of Education required the submission of the data collection instrument to be used by Boston University. This instrument was delivered to the Office of Education by the School of Public Communication on October 30, 1978.

The data collection instrument submitted by the School of Public Communication included a pre- and post-test as well as a teacher's questionnaire. It was designed to test students' previous knowledge of the subject matter and the knowledge gained from participation in and exposure to the curriculum. In addition, the questions concerning demographic information were included in order to gain specific knowledge about the sample population. This knowledge would help the research team better determine the quality and effect of the curriculum. Data collected from

the field test was to be used in revising and improving the curriculum.

However, we were informed by the Office of Education in October, 1978, that it was necessary to obtain forms clearance for the questionnaire included in the data collection instrument. The School of Public Communication, as well as the three other critical television viewing skills contractors, was also informed by OE that clearance of the testing forms could take as long as nine months. Obviously, this lag time was not feasible in a contract with a duration of one year.

To help alleviate the situation and still provide an evaluation of the curriculum, the Office of Education suggested an alternative plan for gathering evaluative data. This alternative plan was outlined in a memo dated November 4, 1978, from the Office of Education. The School of Public Communication, therefore, revised the data collection instrument according to the guidelines provided by the Office of Education. This revised instrument was sent to the Office of Education on December 22, 1978. In addition, the revised instrument was included in the first quarterly report submitted by the School of Public Communication.

At that time, the School of Public Communication also requested a budget and contract modification to reflect the change in work scope of the revised evaluation plan. It was anticipated that the evaluation would begin on February 15, 1979.

Revised Evaluation Plan:

The revised evaluation design suggested by the Office of Education and designed by the School of Public Communication provided for expert evaluation and criticism of the curriculum by no more than nine post-secondary educators. These educators would be from various geographic

locations and various post-secondary institutions. They would either review the material on their own or use the material in class. If the evaluator chose to use the material in class, an observer would record and report on student responses and involvement in the curriculum and curriculum materials. The reports of the evaluators would then be used as a basis for the evaluation report which would also be used as a guide for curriculum revisions.

By the end of the first quarter, the School of Public Communication had designed and submitted a plan for field testing, a data collection instrument, a revised evaluation plan, and evaluation guidelines. Several post-secondary educators were contacted to serve as evaluator/consultants. The School of Public Communication then awaited approval from the Office of Education before beginning the evaluation and finalizing the evaluation staff.

Second Quarter:

The evaluation plan submitted by the School of Public Communication during the first quarter was further revised during the second quarter at the suggestion of the Office of Education. This second revision was submitted to the Office of Education on February 22, 1979. However, after several telephone calls by the School of Public Communication to the Office of Education, OE determined the evaluation package to have been lost in the mail. A duplicate package was re-submitted on March 29, 1979.

Because of the necessity of submitting a second revision to the evaluation plan, the time schedule of the evaluation phase was altered. The School of Public Communication staff anticipated evaluation to have

been completed by April 30, 1979. During the second quarter, though, the eight consultant/evaluators were chosen and contacted by the evaluation staff. Upon their agreement by letter to serve as an evaluator/consultant, the post-secondary professors and instructors were sent the materials on March 21, 1979, with an explanation of the curriculum and its use.

Although not required by the School of Public Communication, many of the evaluation consultants chose to base their evaluations on actual classroom use of the materials. For those consultants, the School of Public Communication staff provided an ample number of materials for students as well as sample evaluation forms. Under consideration by the evaluator/consultants were Module II of the student test, a selection of pertinent readings, and the instructor's guide. Each book was evaluated separately and as a component to a complete curriculum.

Third Quarter:

The evaluation of the curriculum materials did not progress as originally planned by the School of Public Communication. Although all eight evaluator/consultants were ready to begin to use the materials, the Office of Education informed us that we had to submit our evaluation design to the Federal Data Acquisition Committee (FEDAC) for approval. Unfortunately, we were in the same position as in October, 1978. It appeared that the clearance procedure would take several months.

In accordance with the requirements of the Federal Data Acquisition Committee, the School of Public Communication developed and submitted a report entitled "Justification for Evaluation" which outlined our evaluation plan and named our evaluator/consultants. This report was the basis for FEDAC evaluation of our design. It was the understanding

of the School of Public Communication that after FEDAC approval was granted, our intention to evaluate the curriculum would then be published in the Federal Register.

Unfortunately, our design, as well as the evaluation design of WNET (middle-school curriculum developers), was disapproved by the Federal Data Acquisition Committee. It was never made clear to the School of Public Communication why the evaluation design was not approved. However, we worked closely with the U.S.O.E. Project Officer in further revising the design to insure the fulfillment of all government regulations and all terms of our contract with the Office of Education.

Fourth Quarter:

Curriculum evaluation was completed by Boston University's School of Public Communication during the fourth quarter. In addition, our contract with the Office of Education (#300-78-0496) was modified to accommodate a simpler evaluation design. The final evaluation plan followed by the School of Public Communication was:

1) No more than nine consultant/evaluators were selected to review samples of curriculum materials and prepare an evaluation report considering content, format and design. Each consultant was chosen for his/her professional qualifications in television and/or education, as well as for the location and type of his/her educational institution.

2) The evaluator/consultants had the option of personally reviewing the curriculum materials or using the materials in the classroom. Students who examined the curriculum materials did so on a volunteer basis and were not required to submit any formal verbal or written opinion.

3) Observers were sent from Boston University to monitor the curriculum's use in the classroom. These observers submitted detailed reports of

their findings to the School of Public Communication.

4) The evaluator/consultants submitted their evaluation report to the School of Public Communication. Those reports were compiled and interpreted by Dr. F. Larle Barcus, Director of Research for this project.

The evaluation locations chosen by the School of Public Communication included such institutions as the University of Texas, Kent State University, and Stephens College. The general character of the student population varies with each institution, but the School of Public Communication chose areas in which we could conceivably reach students of various racial and ethnic backgrounds. These institutions hopefully gave some cross section of students who might be using the curriculum in the future.

The following is a list of the evaluator/consultants and their educational institutions:

1) Dr. David Houston, Vice President for Academic Affairs, Wiley College, Marshall, Texas.

2) Mr. Gary Brice, Doctoral Student in Communications, Center for the Study of the Aging, University of Buffalo, Buffalo, New York.

3) Mr. George Shaw, Doctoral Student and Teaching Associate, Department of Radio, TV, and Film, University of Texas, Austin, Texas.

4) Ms. Joan Linnows, Massachusetts Education TV, Northeastern University, Boston, Massachusetts.

5) Professor Jerry Lewis, Department of Sociology, Kent State University, Kent, Ohio.

6) Professor Gene Ferraro, Communications Department, Stephens College, Columbia, Missouri.

7) Ms. Betsy Broadman, Doctoral Student, Research Assistant, Harvard School of Education, Cambridge, Massachusetts.

Each evaluator reviewed the curriculum and curriculum materials and commented on such things as the appropriateness of the materials to the educational level of post-secondary students, the marketability of the materials, whether the materials served as an educational impetus encouraging students to seek more information on critical television viewing skills.

In all, the materials were well received by the reviewers and by those students who used them in classes. Any suggestions offered by evaluators were carefully considered by the curriculum development staff and used if valuable.

TASK 3 - DISTRIBUTION

According to contract #300-78-0496, all materials developed for the post-secondary curriculum were to be printed by the Government Printing Office. Upon completion of the printing, the materials would be distributed either by the School of Public Communication or by an acceptable sub-contractor. In its original proposal, the School of Public Communication suggested a sub-contract with Curriculum Development Associates, an educational corporation located in Washington, D. C.

However, it was suggested by the Office of Education and agreed upon by the School of Public Communication that the materials would be offered for commercial publication. The quarterly progress of Task 3 reflects this shift in focus concerning publication.

During the second quarter, the School of Public Communication explored various curriculum distribution systems in the event that the materials would not be published by a commercial publisher. Conversations and interviews were held between the School of Public Communication staff members and the following individuals and institutions:

1) CBS Sunrise Semester

   Contact - Shirley Fisher

2) New York University

   Contact - Myron Price

3) Bergen County Community College

   Contact - Phillip Dohe

4) Media Instructional Association, BCCC

5) Pennsylvania State University

   Contact - Prof. Samuel Dubin; Prof. Joe Biedenbach

6) National Science Foundation

Contact - Dr. Buccino

7) Pennsylvania State Physician Update, WPSX-TV

Contact - North Callahan, Program Director

In addition, the School of Public Communication continued efforts with the Office of Education and the other three critical television viewing skills contractors to settle upon a final course of action concerning publication. During the third quarter a decision was made by the Office of Education and the School of Public Communication to pursue commercial publishing. This option, though, required a contract/ modification to release the School of Public Communication from our obligation to use the Government Printing Office.

TASK 4 - TEACHER TRAINING MATERIALS

The teacher training materials were developed in response to the workshop design decided upon by the School of Public Communication. During the first quarter members of the curriculum development staff began exploring possible workshop designs suitable for post-secondary educators. Of major interest at the time was possible participation in national educational association conferences. However, it was later decided that educational associations often have a disproportionate number of members at the elementary and secondary school levels. In addition, workshops designed solely for use during conferences would not reach community or civic groups, a target audience we felt was important.

The School of Public Communication also considered planning a national conference at the school to be held during the summer of 1980. Although this conference is still a possibility, it would not be an adequate vehicle for training individuals in the use of the critical television viewing skills curriculum.

During the fourth quarter and the extension period, the School of Public Communication finalized workshop plans and developed the teacher training materials. One-day workshops would be given to educators and civic leaders alike and shorter presentations would be given at national conferences. The teacher training materials developed reflected this versatility in workshops.

At the core of the materials is a booklet that is both explanatory and instructional. It is divided into two main sections. The first section explains the intentions behind the project and the reasons for Office of Education funding. It also outlines the curricula of the other three contractors involved in critical television viewing skills.

The second part of the booklet describes the curriculum designed by the School of Public Communication and demonstrates its various uses. Samples of curriculum exercises are also given and explained.

A second component to the teacher training materials is a promotional brochure that will be sent to individuals before they come to the workshops. The brochure is informational yet informal in tone to encourage participation in the workshops.

Additional, but important parts of the teacher training materials are the slide/tape and videotape programs. Designed to be used either as part of the curriculum itself or as teacher-training materials, the audio/visual programs will enhance the workshops and provide participants with a solid overview of topic areas covered in the curriculum.

The Curriculum Review Board:

The Curriculum Review Board assembled for the Critical Television Viewing Skills project by the School of Public Communication represented interests of vital importance to the development of an effective curriculum. On the board were professionals from post-secondary institutions, psychologists, independent television producers, and media executives. Each member brought a tremendous amount of insight into the problems of critical television viewing.

During the first quarter, the Curriculum Review Board came together briefly but examined curriculum materials on an individual basis. Project Director Donis Dondis contacted each member to solicit his/her expert opinion on the design and development of the post-secondary curriculum.

During the second quarter, the Curriculum Review Board met formally to share opinions and comments on the curriculum. A report of that meeting was sent to the Office of Education in February, 1979. Topics of interest during that meeting included curriculum themes, the importance of a non-biased approach, and the need for visual support materials. Suggestions made by the Curriculum Review Board were incorporated into the curriculum.

At all stages of curriculum development the Curriculum Review Board made substantial group and individual contributions. Their professional expertise has added greatly to the conception and development of the post-secondary curriculum.

Publicity:

The School of Public Communication has received a great deal of publicity during the course of this contract. Of particular importance, and rather unfortunately, was the "award" of the Golden Fleece Award to the Office of Education for the funding of this project. Senator Proxmire chose the funding for the post-secondary curriculum as an object of criticism in December, 1978.

Although on face value the "award" might appear insignificant, it had a strong impact on the progress of curriculum development. The School of Public Communication received many letters asking for explanations and information and Dean Dondis was requested to appear on several local and regional television and radio programs throughout January of 1979. In addition, the School of Public Communication was responsible for generating all publicity in defense of the project and the merits of Office of Education funding.

There were, however, some positive effects as a result of Senator Proxmire's actions. Media awareness groups and consumer action groups became aware of our work and offered letters of encouragement. Members of Congress also sent letters of support for the nature and need of our work. Further, the national publicity gained by the Golden Fleece Award made the general public aware of all the critical television viewing skills contractors. It has certainly been much easier for all the contractors to place articles and information in various publications and solicit interviews on critical television viewing. Although it is unfortunate that we had to receive such a dubious and unfair "honor,"

it seems that in the long run its contribution was more positive than negative.

Other publicity efforts shared by the School of Public Communication were the inclusion in articles on critical television viewing that appeared in such publications as TV Guide, Media Methods, American Educator, Ladies Home Journal, and others. At all times, the School of Public Communication remained cooperative and receptive to all publicity endeavors.

EXTENSION PERIOD

Although the termination date for Phase I was set at September 29, 1979, Boston University's School of Public Communication requested a three-month no-cost extension of the contract from the U. S. Office of Education. The extension period has changed the contract termination date to December 31, 1979.

First, during the academic year 1978-79 Boston University was involved in three major labor disputes which lead to strikes. As dean of the School of Public Communication, Project Director Donis Dondis was required to spend a substantial amount of time and attention on the crises at hand. As a result, work progress on the curriculum did not go as anticipated. And, because the contribution of Dean Dondis was crucial in establishing the theoretical base for the curriculum, the curriculum development staff wanted to insure her full participation.

Second, the receipt of the Golden Fleece Award, as described earlier, took valuable time away from actual curriculum development. A tremendous amount of effort had to be re-channeled to fighting negative publicity and generating positive publicity for the project. Again, Dean Dondis

was central to this effort.

And third, the problems faced by the School of Public Communication in Task 2 - Evaluation - caused further unavoidable setbacks. Because we were delayed in the evaluation phase of the project due to O. E. regulation requirements, we could not completely finish the curriculum. It was our understanding that the evaluation was to serve as the basis for revision and final preparation of the curriculum materials. The more the evaluation was delayed, the more the final manuscript and camera-ready copy had to be delayed.

The three-month extension period allowed the School of Public Communication the opportunity to finish the curriculum, the audio/visual materials, and the proposal for Phase II.

Curriculum Development:

During the extension period, the curriculum underwent a final edit and was redesigned according to the suggestions of the Office of Education Review Committee. In addition, the curriculum was placed in final form including the instructor's guide and the companion workbook.

The Audio/Visual Materials:

Final production of the videotape and slide/tape programs were finished during the fourth quarter. However, the extension period was used to completely edit the videotape and secure any missing permissions.

Phase II Proposal:

The extension period was also used to fully prepare our design for Phase II. Included in this work was the securing of locations for training and informative workshops to be held in various locations across

the country. Because the School of Public Communication expanded its post-secondary target group to include community groups, many of these groups have been included on the Workshop schedule.

Throughout Phase I of the Critical Viewing Skills contract the School of Public Communication has made diligent efforts to maintain communication with the U. S. Office of Education Contract Officer, Peggy Saunders. In all tasks of Phase I, we have, to the best of our knowledge, thoroughly complied with all federal regulations and contract requirements. In addition, the School of Public Communication has maintained productive lines of communication with the other Critical Television Viewing Skills contractors: Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development, WNET-Channel 13, and Southwest Educational Development Laboratory.

PHASE II ACTIVITIES

March 1, 1980 - July 31, 1981

Beginning March 1, 1980, Boston University's School of Public Communication began Phase II of contract #300-78-0496, Critical Television Viewing Skills for post-secondary students. The principal task of Phase II was to conduct 20 training workshops for education and community groups on a national scale. The primary purpose of the workshops was to introduce the concept of critical television viewing skills and train workshop participants in the use of the curriculum developed by Boston University. In addition, the workshops were designed to train participants to conduct their own workshops in critical television viewing skills for other groups.

The second task of Phase II was the dissemination of the curriculum materials developed under Phase I of the contract. Dissemination took place in three ways: samples of the curriculum materials were distributed to workshop participants; materials were sent by mail to those who requested review copies; efforts were launched to secure a commercial publisher.

Ongoing activities of the project included project administration, publicity efforts, and maintaining project correspondence. All tasks of Phase II will be described in detail in the body of this report.

WORKSHOPS - QUARTERLY PROGRESS

Because of its target population, Boston University had a unique set of problems to overcome in designing a workable format for the required 20 workshops. In addition to the differences in the needs of education and community groups, Boston University had to pay particular attention to the differences within the adult population we served. For example, those involved in adult education had an entirely different set of priorities from those involved in traditional institutions of higher education. Therefore, our workshop format had to be informative, yet flexible, to best serve our target groups.

The following is an example of a typical critical television viewing skills workshop conducted by Boston University:

9:00 - 9:15	Registration and distribution of materials.
9:15 - 9:30	Project and staff introductions; introduction to the workshop.
9:30 - 10:45	What are Critical Television Viewing Skills; audio/visual presentation; lecture; discussion.
10:45 - 11:00	Morning break.
11:00 - 11:30	Boston University's curriculum demonstration.
11:30 - 12:00	"Living with Television" (videotape produced by Boston University for this project.)
12:00 - 1:00	Lunch.
1:00 - 2:30	Curriculum exercises based on one particular module of the curriculum; videotape presentation.

2:30 - 2:45 Afternoon break.

2:45 - 3:30 Incorporating critical television viewing skills in individual settings.

3:30 - end Questions.

For institutions of higher learning, the workshop staff concentrated on ways to incorporate critical television viewing skills and the Boston University curriculum into existing college courses. For example, many instructors and professors were interested in critical television viewing skills as they applied to popular culture, sociology, psychology, or modern literature, as well as other subject areas.

Workshops for other post-secondary instructors, such as those of continuing or adult education programs, focused primarily on demonstrating effective adoptions of the curriculum as a whole unit. These workshops also stressed training for conducting other workshops in critical television viewing skills.

During its workshop schedule, the Boston University workshop staff worked to maintain a beneficial and flexible format to best meet the needs of the participants across the country.

WORKSHOP SITES:

1. SEDL Workshop on Children & Television, Washington, D. C.
2. Association of Educational Communications & Technology, Denver, Colorado.
3. East Texas Educational Opportunities Center, Longview, Texas.
4. USC/Los Angeles Unified School District, Los Angeles, California.
5. California State University, School of Education, Fullerton, California.
6. University of Pittsburgh, School of Education, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania.
7. University of Alaska and Alaska State PTA, Juneau and Anchorage, Alaska.
8. Evergreen College, Boston University, Boston, Massachusetts.
9. Mineral County Vocational and Technical Center for Adult Ed, Keyser, W. Va.

10. Catholic Communications Northwest, Portland, Oregon.
11. San Francisco State University, San Francisco, California.
12. California State University, Long Beach, California.
13. Brighton Elderly Jewish Community Center, Brighton, Massachusetts.
14. National Association for Educational Broadcasters, Las Vegas, Nevada.
15. National Adult Education Association Conference, St. Louis, Missouri.
16. New England Educators/WNET, Boston, Massachusetts.
17. Boston Schools & Parents, Boston, Massachusetts.
18. International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union.
19. Vermont Educational Television, Burlington, Vermont.
20. Trevecca-Nazarene College, Nashville, Tennessee.
21. AFL-CIO, New Britain, Connecticut.

FIRST QUARTER - PHASE II

During the first quarter of Phase II, Boston University conducted and participated in five training workshops in critical television viewing skills. The workshop sites were as follows:

1. SEDL Workshop on Children and Television, Washington, D. C.
2. Association of Educational Communications and Technology Conference, Denver, Colorado.
3. East Texas Educational Opportunities Center, Texas Association of Developing Colleges, Longview, Texas.
4. USC/Los Angeles Unified School District, Los Angeles, California.
5. California State University, School of Education, Fullerton, California.

1. SEDL Workshop on Children and Television:

The SEDL workshop was attended by representatives from various educational and community-action groups concerned with television programming and its effects on children. As a co-contractor with SEDL, Boston University sent representatives to participate in the conference and lead our expertise in the area of adult and/or parent education. Boston University also displayed the post-secondary curriculum materials and provided sample copies to representatives from other groups and institutions.

2. Association of Educational Communications and Technology Conference:

During the AECT Conference in Denver, Boston University joined with the other critical viewing skills projects and Prime Time School Television to present a full-day pre-conference workshop entitled, "Television and Education." During the afternoon session, the Boston University staff conducted a special session for those interested in the post-secondary materials. In all, over 200 educators participated in the workshop.

3. East Texas Educational Opportunities Center:

The ETEDC is a program of the Texas Association of Developing Colleges, an organization with a high percentage of minority colleges as members. Representatives from local colleges, such as LeTourneau College, as well as church groups and PTA members, joined the regular ETEDC members for the day-long workshop. Many participants voiced an interest in conducting their own workshop in critical television viewing skills in the East Texas area.

4. USC/Los Angeles Unified School District:

Boston University conducted a full-day workshop for top-level L. A. School administrators, higher-education liaisons, community leaders, PTA

representatives, and post-secondary educators in the greater Los Angeles area. The workshop was conducted in conjunction with the USC Davidson Conference Center, a continuing and community education center.

5. California State University at Fullerton:

The full-day workshop at Cal. State Education School was attended by post secondary educators, PTA members (including Virginia Macy, member of the National PTA Council on Television), community leaders and top administrators from local school systems. The workshop sparked enough interest to serve as the basis for a course offered at Cal. State entitled, "Children and Television." The Boston University curriculum materials were also placed in the Education School library for future reference.

SECOND QUARTER - PHASE II

During the second quarter of Phase II, Boston University conducted four training workshops. As is typical in education, summer proved to be a slower time in the workshop schedule. The second-quarter workshops were for:

1. University of Pittsburgh, School of Education, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania.
2. University of Alaska and Alaska PTA, Juneau and Anchorage, Alaska.
3. Evergreen College, Boston University, Boston, Massachusetts.
4. Mineral County Vocational and Technical Center for Adult Education, Keyser, West Virginia.

1. University of Pittsburgh, School of Education:

The workshop given at the University of Pittsburgh was part of a week-long seminar exploring critical television viewing skills. The Boston University day-long session began the week for education professors, teachers and representatives from WQED-TV, the Pittsburgh educational television station.

2. University of Alaska and Alaska PTA:

The Juneau campus of the University of Alaska hosted the Boston University workshop staff as part of their summer continuing education course offerings. Post-secondary educators as well as community leaders made up the target population. In Anchorage, Alaska, however, the workshop was hosted by the state PTA. Since Boston University conducted its critical viewing skills workshop in Alaska, the state department of education has appropriated several thousand dollars to the adoption of critical television viewing skills in Alaska schools. In addition to the Boston University staff, members of the WNET project staff were asked to advise in this matter.

3. Evergreen College:

The project staff at Boston University conducted a special session in critical viewing skills for participants in Evergreen College, a model program in education for senior citizens in the Boston area.

4. Mineral County Vocational and Technical Center for Adult Education:

Boston University's workshop in critical television viewing skills was a special component of the regional curriculum development program. As such, it was attended by educators of all age groups, but most particularly those concerned with adult education. The Mineral County Education Center is also planning to offer in-service credit for further workshops in critical television viewing skills.

THIRD QUARTER - PHASE II

During the third quarter of Phase II, Boston University conducted nine critical viewing skills workshops. In addition to the nine workshops, Boston University also offered special presentations that varied in length

and format. The workshop sites were as follows:

1. Catholic Communications/Northwest, Portland, Oregon.
2. San Francisco State University, San Francisco, California
3. California State University, Long Beach, California.
4. Brighton Elderly Jewish Community Center, Brighton, Massachusetts.
5. National Association for Educational Broadcasters, Las Vegas, Nevada.
6. National Adult Education Association Conference, St. Louis, Missouri.
7. New England Educators/Co-sponsored with WNET, Boston, Massachusetts.
8. Boston Schools and Parents, District 1, Boston, Massachusetts.
9. International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union, New York, New York.

1. Catholic Communications/Northwest:

The workshop was conducted for parochial educators in a five-state region of the Northwest. In addition to the educators, individuals responsible for curriculum development and staff training attended the workshop. Since the Boston University workshop, Catholic Communications/ Northwest has conducted its own workshops in critical television viewing skills, using the Boston University materials.

2. San Francisco State University:

This workshop was initially conceived as a community outreach project for the university. However, San Francisco State changed the makeup of the audience by inviting professional broadcast educators. We found that our materials were too simplistic for use in courses for broadcast majors but were appropriate in most other post-secondary settings.

3. California State University at Long Beach:

The English Department of Cal. State hosted the workshop in conjunction with the TV-Radio and Broadcasting department. The English Department was primarily concerned with the constructive use of TV in the classroom to enhance language skills and appreciation. On the other

hand, the TV-Radio Broadcasting Department was most interested in training students to sharpen their own critical television viewing skills in conjunction with strengthening their television literacy competencies.

4. Brighton Elderly Jewish Community Center:

This workshop was planned to demonstrate the appropriateness of the Boston University curriculum materials for the elderly. The workshop was so successful that the Center has asked for sets of the materials for their library and is planning to keep informed on critical television viewing skills developments.

5. National Association of Educational Broadcasters:

The Boston University project staff was invited to present the project and materials at a special session of the NAEB Annual Conference. Those who attended the session were primarily post-secondary educators; however, several participants represented public television stations and instructional and/or educational television.

6. National Adult Education Association:

Because of the specialization of the organization, the Boston University project staff asked their continuing education consultant, Dr. Donald Dunbar, to speak to the audience of adult educators. He stressed the role of television in adult life and described how television affects the adult education system. In addition, the critical television viewing skills materials were presented and demonstrated.

7. New England Educators/Co-sponsored with WNET:

Because of the complimentary nature of our curricula in critical television viewing skills, Boston University and the WNET project staff decided to co-sponsor a large workshop for New England educators at all educational levels. Both Boston University and WNET felt that the joint workshop was an effective way of bringing post-secondary, secondary, and

elementary school educators together to discuss critical television viewing skills.

8. Boston Schools and Parents, District 1:

The workshop for the Boston Schools and Parents was attended by a wide range of participants - both secondary and post-secondary educators, media specialists, parents, curriculum coordinators and representatives from the Boston Home and School Association. As a follow-up to this workshop, a presentation was made to a large audience of the Boston Home and School Association to train parents in the need for critical television viewing skills.

9. International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union:

This workshop was attended by union education directors, top-level administrators, district leaders, as well as other union members. The union's education directors were interested in being trained to use our curriculum in critical viewing skills workshops they are planning to conduct for union members. It was most interesting to note the versatility of the Boston University materials in non-traditional educational programs.

FOURTH QUARTER - PHASE II

During the fourth quarter of Phase II, Boston University conducted three full-day workshops in critical television viewing skills. For purposes of this report, fourth quarter activities will include those of the contract extension period beyond March 1, 1981. The workshop sites were as follows:

1. Vermont Educational Television (ETV), Burlington, Vermont.

This workshop in Burlington, Vermont, was designed specifically for those educators involved with instructional educational television.

Participants were from the area's colleges and universities as well as local school systems and community groups.

2. Trevecca-Nazarene College:

Of particular interest in this workshop was the diversity of the participants. While most were from surrounding colleges, many came from extremely rural areas where television plays a large part in the social and educational life of the residents. Many of the participants were also involved in religious education at some level and represented various area churches. In addition, members of local PTA chapters and other parent organizations attended. In all, the reception for the materials was extremely enthusiastic and many plan to offer critical television viewing skills as part of existing college courses.

3. AFL-CIO:

As with the I.L.G.W.U., the AFL-CIO was very interested in offering its members educational programs that would encourage them to be more active in their individual unions. Boston University's workshop in critical television viewing skills offered the AFL-CIO an opportunity to train its educational leaders in teaching critical television viewing skills to its member unions. The workshop was attended by representatives from unions all over the Northeast.

SUMMARY:

In constructing the Phase II workshop schedule, Boston University paid particular attention to geographic location and variety of host organizations. It was our intention to bring the curriculum materials to as many areas of the country as possible while, at the same time, trying to reach a variety of post-secondary institutions. As a result

of the workshops we have a mailing list of several hundred educators and community leaders interested in critical television viewing skills. In some cases, the Boston University project staff served as consultants for groups organizing their own critical television viewing skills workshops and training programs.

PUBLISHING - QUARTERLY PROGRESS

During Phase I of this contract, the Department of Education determined that all four critical television viewing skills contractors should pursue commercial publication of their curriculum materials. Toward this end, Boston University researched the field and devised a list of potential publishers for the post-secondary materials. The critical television viewing skills staff also prepared a publisher's package of information on the project and samples of the materials, as well as a description of marketing exposure through the workshop schedule and other publicity opportunities.

Publisher's packages were sent to the following publishers during Phase I and Phase II:

1. The MIT Press.
2. Houghton-Mifflin Company.
3. Random House, Inc.
4. Scott, Foresman & Company.
5. Fearon-Pitman Publishers, Inc.
6. Addison-Wesley Publishing Co., Inc.
7. Iowa State University Press.
8. Cambridge Book Company.
9. Witt-Freeman & Co., Publishers.

10. Goodyear Publishing Co., Inc.
11. William C. Brown Co., Publishers.
12. Science Research Associates, Inc.
13. Grid Publishing, Inc.

The initial response from the package was favorable from three publishers: The MIT Press, Iowa State University Press, and Grid Publishing. To these publishers we sent complete manuscripts for review.

The MIT Press reviews were mixed. In general, reviewers felt that the materials were good, but that the subject matter was not advanced enough to bear the MIT Press name. Iowa State University Press and Grid Publishing both offered contracts for the publication of the materials.

Because of the speed with which Grid could publish the books, Boston University chose the Grid contract. Iowa State University Press then withdrew their offer of a contract. It was agreed between Boston University and Grid Publishing that Boston University would supply camera-ready material to Grid for the entire set of materials. Boston University then prepared a complete camera-ready manuscript.

In order for the contract to become effective, the U. S. Department of Education's Copyright Administrator had to grant copyright authorization to Boston University. Unfortunately, at the time Boston University requested copyright authorization (end of November, 1980), the U. S. Office of Education was becoming the U. S. Department of Education and was involved in a tremendous amount of administrative paperwork. Our request was not handled until late March, 1981. Because of the delay and because Grid Publishing revamped their marketing strategy, Grid withdrew their offer of a publishing contract.

Boston University then resubmitted the manuscript to Random House, Inc. for further publishing consideration and will continue to search for an appropriate publisher. However, we will try to provide materials to those organizations that request sample review copies.

PROJECT PUBLICITY

Throughout Phase II, the Boston University critical television viewing skills project has received substantial publicity across the country. Media coverage generally followed workshops; often the workshops made the evening news in many locations. In addition, the project received a great deal of print publicity in most workshop sites.

Of special interest were television appearances on local public television stations and feature articles in educational journals. For example, project staff members appeared on "Prime Time" - WBZ-TV, Boston; WNET-TV Satellite Broadcast; WGBH, Boston; KIXE-TV, Redding, California; and several radio shows. Articles have appeared in The Boston Globe, PTA Today, Media & Methods Magazine, The Real Paper, and others. Each instance of media coverage has prompted many requests for information and samples of the materials.

PROJECT SUMMARY

As was mentioned earlier in this report, the main challenge for Boston University in preparing a curriculum for post-secondary students was to make it versatile enough to meet the needs of the wide variety of post-secondary students. Throughout our research on the target audience it became more and more apparent that while adults and adult educators felt that critical television viewing skills should be important components in a school system curriculum, they had very little idea how to begin. In fact, they had a less-than-clear understanding of what critical television viewing skills would mean to their own viewing habits.

During our workshop schedule, most participants were eager to incorporate critical television viewing skills into their own lives in order to best influence their children's and students' viewing habits and understanding. It is the Boston University's project staff's belief that education and demonstration of critical television viewing skills must continue at the adult and post-secondary level in order to best prepare future parents and teachers to effectively cope with the impact of television on children. In addition, our experiences with such groups as the I.L.G.W.U. and the AFL-CIO have convinced us that adult television viewers must continue to explore the effect of television on the thinking, voting and buying habits of the American population. The materials developed by Boston University are a first step in this effort. It is our hope that further efforts will be launched.

Boston University will continue to be an informational source for groups and individuals interested in developing programs in critical television viewing skills. We will also continue our role as consultants

for colleges and universities presently teaching critical television viewing skills (Yeshiva University, N. Y.; Kennesaw College, Georgia; University of Pittsburgh, PA; Concordia University, Montreal; California State University; and others). We will also continue to search for a viable publishing and distribution arrangement for the curriculum materials and will keep the Department of Education informed of our progress.